REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 10, 13, 18-21, and 23 have been amended and claims 34-37 have been canceled.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7-10, 13-17, 20, 21, 23-25, 27, 29-31, and 34-37 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) for being anticipated by the Lewis patent. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

The Lewis patent discloses sending e-mails from a server to a Blackberry terminal through an internet connection. (See Figure 1). The purpose of the Lewis system is essentially to prevent unwanted (so-called spam) e-mails from being sent to the terminal. (See column 2, line 64 - column 3, line 3). In contrast, the Lewis patent does not disclose a data terminal unit which sends information indicative of an operational state of a repeater to a server through the mobile IP network, and that the server sends commands to the data terminal unit through the mobile IP network for correcting a malfunction of the repeater in response to said operational state information.

Without a disclosure of these features, which have been added by amendment to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the Lewis patent cannot anticipate claim 1 or any of its dependent claims.

Claim 7 recites "transmitting packet data for correcting a malfunction of a repeater from the server to the data terminal unit through the mobile IP network," and "sending the packet data indicative of an operational state of said repeater from the data terminal unit to said repeater using the second link established through the mobile IP network." The Lewis patent does not

11

disclose these features, i.e., Lewis discloses transmitting e-mails through an IP network to a mobile terminal. However, the features added to claim 7 are not disclosed in Lewis.

Claim 7 further recites "wherein the packet data for correcting said malfunction is transmitted though the mobile IP network to the data terminal unit in response to transmission of the packet data indicative of said operational state of the repeater." These features are also missing from the Lewis disclosure.

Because the Lewis patent does not disclose all the features of claim 7, it is respectfully submitted that the Lewis patent does not anticipate this claim or any of its dependent claims.

Claim 10 recites that the method of claim 7 further includes "checking a version of control software embedded in the repeater" and "updating the repeater with a new version of the control software transmitted from the server to the data terminal unit through the mobile IP network." These features are not disclosed by the Lewis patent, i.e., Lewis discloses screening spam-type e-mails from being sent to a Blackberry terminal. Lewis does not disclose updating a repeater with a new version of control software transmitted through a mobile IP network, after the recited software version checking step has been performed.

Claim 13 recites that the "data terminal equipment sends information indicative of operation of the repeater to the server through the mobile IP network and wherein the server sends commands to the data terminal equipment through the mobile IP network for correcting a malfunction of the repeater in response to said operation information." The Lewis patent does not disclose these features. Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 20 recites the additional steps of "collecting information required for repeater

management and remote control, and reporting the information to the server at an information

report time." These features are not disclosed by the Lewis patent.

Claim 21 recites that the "collected information indicates at least one of whether the

repeater is in operation or a version of control software in the repeater, wherein the operation

information includes the collected information." These features are not disclosed by the Lewis

patent.

Claim 23 recite that the "information indicative of an operational state of the repeater is

transmitted to the server through at least the mobile IP network portion of the first link and

wherein the server sends commands to the repeater through at least the mobile IP network

portion of the first link for correcting a malfunction of the repeater in response to said

operational state information." These features are not disclosed by the Lewis patent.

Claims 6, 11, 12, 22, 26, 32, and 33 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being

obvious in view of a Lewis-Sen combination. This rejection is traversed on grounds that the Sen

patent does not teach or suggest the features in the independent claims missing from the Lewis

patent.

Claims 18, 19, and 28 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of

a Lewis-Nakashima combination. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

The Nakashima patent discloses a system which monitors the status of a network and

then transmits status information for the network to a monitoring station through a broadcast

unit. However, the Nakashima patent does not disclose the features of claim 13 missing from the

Lewis patent, including a data terminal equipment which "sends information indicative of

operation of the repeater to the server through the mobile IP network" and "wherein the server

sends commands to the data terminal equipment through the mobile IP network for correcting a

malfunction of the repeater in response to said operation information."

Absent a teaching or suggestion of these features, it is respectfully submitted that claim

13 and its dependent claims are allowable over a Lewis-Nakashima combination, and that claims

18 and 19 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 13.

Claim 18 separately recites the additional steps of "collecting status information of the

repeater connected to said data terminal equipment, and then reporting the status information to

the server at an information report time, wherein said operation information includes the status

information." These features are not disclosed by Lewis, whether taken alone or in combination

with Nakashima.

Claim 19 recites that "the status information includes information indicative of a cause of

an alarm occurring at the repeater and information relating to an internal location of the repeater

when the alarm has occurred." These features are not disclosed by Lewis, whether taken alone or

in combination with Nakashima.

Claim 28 depends from claim 23, which recites features similar to those which patentably

distinguish claim 13 from a Lewis-Nakashima combination. Accordingly, it is respectfully

submitted that claim 28 is also allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the

application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the

application are respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

Daniel Y. J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777
Date: February 28, 2007
Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610
\\Fk4\Documents\2029\2029-035\118345.doc